

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Jai Singh, and the management of M/s. Sooraj Steel Industries Ltd., Industrial Area, Sonapat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 24632-37, dated 13th July, 1984 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Singh, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as a sealing helper with the respondent for the last 3½ years on monthly wages of Rs. 365 and that his services were terminated by the respondent unlawfully on 4th December, 1983 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The respondent appeared in furtherance of the notice issued to him. Before he could file a reply to the demand notice, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement mark "X", where under the workman has chosen to relinquish his claim for re-employment and back wages. His accounts have been fully and finally settled by the management. So, now no dispute survives for adjudication. So, this reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 12th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Endorsement No. 113-84/3638, dated 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/8556.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Kalra Pulp and Board Mills Pvt. Ltd., Barota Road, Near Jatheri, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 2 of 1983

between

SHRI GUDRI PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S KALRA PULP  
AND BOARD MILLS PVT. LTD., BAROTA ROAD, NEAR JATHERI, SONEPAT

Present.—

Shri S. N. Solanki, A. R., for the workman.

Shri Vijay Kalra, A. R., for the management.

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Gudri Parshad and the management of M/s. Kalra Pulp and Board Mills Pvt. Ltd., Barota Road, near



Jatheri, Sonapat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/SPT/149/82/57746-57, dated 30th December, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gudri Parshad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as a Gardener about six months ago on monthly wages of Rs 350, but his services were terminated by the management unlawfully on 6th August, 1982 in gross violation of provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A reply was filed by the respondent, controverting the claim of the petitioner.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issue was settled for decision on 20th April, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gudri Parshad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. Before the parties could adduce any evidence on merits, an amicable settlement was arrived at, whereunder the workman has been paid a sum of Rs 500 by the management in full and final settlement of his claim. In that behalf statement of the workman has been recorded. So, now no dispute survives for adjudication. This reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated 13th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Endorsement No. 283/3645, dated 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/8557.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Vanaspati and General Mills, Kundli (Sonapat).

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 34 of 81

between.

SHRI TEJ PAUL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARYANA VANASPATI  
AND GENERAL MILLS, KUNDLI (SONEPAT)

Present.—

Shri R. N. Solanki, A. R., for the workman.

Shri C. K. Agrawal, A. R., for the management.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Tej Paul and the management of M/s. Haryana Vanaspati and General Mills, Kundli (Sonapat), to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/SPT/12/81/8476, dated 16th February, 1981 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Tej Paul was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?



2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as Jeep Driver with the respondent about six years ago on monthly wages of Rs. 250, but his services were terminated by the management unlawfully on 6th October, 1980 without complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A detailed written statement was filed by the respondent controverting the pleas taken by the workman. I need not discuss the same because this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision on 18th August, 1981 :—

- (1) Whether the reference is bad in law and not maintainable as there exists no relationship of master and servant between the parties ? OPM.
- (2) If issue No. 1 decided against the management, whether the termination of services of Shri Tej Paul was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. After the parties had gone through the gamut of adducing evidence, a settlement was arrived at, whereunder the management has paid a sum of Rs. 1,500 *in toto* to the workman, who has agreed to relinquish his claim regarding reinstatement and back wages. So, now no dispute survives for adjudication. This reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 13th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Endorsement No. 3481/3644, dated the 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/8558.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Baljeet Packers (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 33 of 1984

between

SHRI RAM AVTAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BALJEET PACKERS (P) LTD., BAHADURGARH

Present.—

None, for the workman.

Shri M. M. Kaushal, A. R., for the management.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Ram Avtar and the management of M/s. Baljeet Packers (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh, to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 13277-52, dated 29th March, 1984:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Avtar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?



2. The workman alleged that he was employed with the respondent since June, 1982 but was unlawfully terminated on 30th July, 1983 and that the wages being drawn by him were Rs. 425 per mensem.

3. After receipt of the order of reference, registered notices were issued to the parties. The management appeared. The registered notice sent to the workman was received unserved, because his address as given on the order of reference was through Shri Sunder Dev Tiwari, Luxmi Bhavan, Jhajjar Road, Bahadurgarh. Shri M.M. Kaushal, Authorised Representative of the management stated that Shri Tiwari has since died. Furthermore he has placed on record a photo copy of the settlement and the receipt dated 3rd January, 1984 executed by the workman. So, it seems that the dispute between the parties have been settled and that is the reason that the workman is not coming forth. So, in my opinion, no dispute survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 5th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 32-84/3647, dated 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

**No. 9/5/84-Lab./8561.**—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Chemical Industries M.I.E., Bahadurgarh.

**BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK**

**Reference No. 225 of 1983**

*between*

**SHRI BHUMI KESHWAR WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARYANA  
CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES MIE. BAHADURGARH**

**Present.—**

None, for the workman.  
Shri M. M. Kaushal, A. R., for the management.

#### **AWARD**

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Bhumi Keshwar and the management of M/s Haryana Chemical Industries M.I.E., Bahadurgarh to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 59342-47, dated 11th November, 1982 :—

**Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhumi Kashwar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?**

2. The workman averred that he was in the employment of the respondent since the month of February, 1981 on monthly wages of Rs 350, but his services were terminated by the management in the month of May/June, 1983 in gross violation of section 25-F and 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared through Shri Dhan Singh his Authorised Representative, but latter on absented, the management has placed on record a settlement arrived at with the workman dated 31st October, 1983. It seems that the



workman absented because he had arrived at a settlement with the management. So, no dispute survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated, the 7th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 225-83/3650, dated the 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab/8562.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of Market Committee, Gohana District Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 98 of 1983

*between*

SHRI MOHINDER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MARKET  
COMMITTEE, GOHANA, DISTRICT SONEPAT

Present.—

Shri S. N. Vats, A.R., for the workman in person.

Shri M. C. Bhardawaj, A. R., for the management.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Mohinder Singh and the management of Market Committee, Gohana, District, Sonepat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 1D/SPT/42-83/31000-05, dated 30th June, 1983:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mohinder Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was working as waterman with the respondent since 4th October, 1980 but his services were unlawfully terminated by the management on 31st March, 1982 in gross violation of provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A detailed reply was filed by the management, completely controverting the claim of the petitioner. I need not discuss the pleas taken by the respondent, because this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.

4. On the pleadings, of the parties, the following issue was framed on 7th September, 1984:—

1. Whether termination of service of Shri Mohinder Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. Before any evidence could be adduced by the parties, happily a settlement was arrived at, whereunder the respondent has agreed to reinstate the workman on a permanent basis without back wages



with continuity of service. In that behalf a statement of Shri Ram Rattan, Executive Officer-cum-Secretary of the respondent has been recorded and that of the workman. The management further agreed that the workman can join his duties w.e.f. 19th November, 1984. Accordingly no dispute survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 14th November, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 98-83/3651, dated the 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab./8564.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Ware Housing Corporation, Sector 17, Chandigarh.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 100 of 1983

between

SHRI HUKAM CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA WARE HOUSING CORPORATION, SECTOR 17, CHANDIGARH

Present :—

None, for the workman.

Shri Satish Chand, A.R., for the respondent.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Hukam Chand and the management of Haryana Ware Housing Corporation, Sector 17, Chandigarh, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/31020—24, dated 30th June, 1983 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hukam Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. The workman alleged that he was serving as Godown Attendant-cum-Watchman with the respondent and that a false case of theft was foisted upon him and without holding any enquiry, a sum of Rs. 620 was deducted from his wages and thereafter his services were terminated unlawfully.

3. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared.

4. A detailed reply was filed by the respondent. It has controverted the claim of the workman in toto. I need not discuss the pleas because this reference is being answered for non-prosecution of the same by the workman, because later on the workman absented and as such this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and answered accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 14th November, 1984

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.



Endst. No. 100-83/3653, dated the 22nd November, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab./8567.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Organo Rubber (P.) Ltd., Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 160 of 1984

*between*

SHRI SHIV NATH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ORGANO RUBBER (P.) LTD., SONEPAT

*Present :—*

Shri Bahadur Yadav, A.R., for the workman.

Shri Rajinder Singh, A.R., for the management.

#### AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes, between the workman Shri Shiv Nath and the Management of M/s. Organo Rubber (P) Ltd., Sonapat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 33509-14, dated 3rd September, 1984 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shiv Nath was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. The workman alleged that he was working with the respondent for the last about two years on monthly wages of Rs. 358 but his services were terminated unlawfully by the respondent on 1st September, 1983 after giving a complete go-bye to the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The parties appeared in pursuance of the notices given to them. The respondent did not file any reply but alleged settlement with the workman and the learned Authorised Representative of the workman Shri Bahadur Yadav made a statement in the Court in that behalf. So, now no dispute survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Dated the 14th November, 1984.

Endst No. 160-84/3656, dated the 22nd November, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.